

Let us, by all means, co-operate; let us find out whether the business side of their JOURNAL is of sufficient interest to the members of the Society to make it of any advantage to advertisers to patronize our publication; if the business is not of any particular interest, then let us quit publication, for otherwise we are obtaining money by false pretense.

But the view of this advertising question is not absolutely black and gloomy. Many of our advertisers report a good deal of interest; one eastern house wrote us gratuitously **NOT ALL BLACK** saying that they had received over two hundred letters of inquiry; another advertiser states that he feels that nearly all of his California business has been built up as a result of his advertising in your JOURNAL; another eastern house, which formerly advertised with us, reports that its business in California has decidedly diminished since it discontinued its advertisements, and it is now planning to resume advertising in your JOURNAL this winter. All these things are pleasant, to be sure, but they do not counteract the gloomy influence of a report of "lack of interest." There should be no lack of interest. Your interest in your JOURNAL should be sustained and continuous; it should not be spasmodic or intermittent. You should make it your business to read the advertising pages every month and to take a continued and growing interest in the advertisers in your JOURNAL.

When the JOURNAL was started, a question of policy arose and received considerable discussion by the Publication Committee; should a **PERSONAL MENTION** column or more of personal items be published each month? "Dr. Doe has gone to Europe; Dr. Roe has returned; Dr. Jones has visited the South; Dr. Brown, of Los Angeles, has been staying in San Francisco"—and that sort of thing. It was then decided not to publish a department of this sort; several times since then the question has been raised and each time has been similarly decided. It was reasoned that, if the JOURNAL published an item to the effect that Dr. Doe had gone to Europe and did not note the fact that Dr. Roe—also a member—had likewise gone to the same place, Dr. Roe might feel slighted and feel a certain amount of resentment against the Society. Obviously, it would be practically impossible to secure reliable information of the movements of every member of the Society, and thus a good many members would, from time to time, be slighted and an injury would result to the Society that would be more serious than the omission of all personal items. Again, the JOURNAL has been requested to publish a department of personal mention, and we put the question up to the members; what do you think about it?

According to a dispatch to the *Call*, Dr. T. H. Dixon, of Knight's Landing, a prohibition town, was recently convicted for selling **ANOTHER CONVICTION** liquor. He would write prescriptions for liquor and then fill them himself at his own drug store, and on testimony to this effect he was convicted; it

is said the case will be appealed. The matter has been referred to the Board of Medical Examiners, and it is probable that the Board will take steps to revoke the license of this physician. There is no special and particular reason why one licensed to practice medicine should consider himself licensed to violate any of the laws of the State. Crooks and criminals there are in every profession and in every calling, but to find them in the profession of medicine is not pleasant. The time, however, when they could continue their crookedness or their criminality with impunity, in this State has passed, and slowly but surely they are to be weeded out.

The opposition of certain well known "interests" to the creation by the national Congress of a Department or Bureau of Public **DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.** Health continues, even though Congress is not in session. A committee of eminent citizens (of which we shall have more to say later), has been formed to promote the organization of such interests in what is known as the "League for Medical Freedom," in California. The "League" also continues its press bureau and its supply of distorted and tainted news and successfully works some of the largest papers in the country. A distorted story was published not long ago in the New York Herald, headed "President Taft gave to-day the knockout blow to the Department of Health proposed by the 'Doctors' Trust'." As a matter of fact, President Taft did no such thing; he has fully approved of the effort to secure as much attention to the health of children as is given to the health of pigs, and his attitude has not changed. During the weeks when the Owen Bill was before Congress, this "League for Medical Freedom" (composed of the interests that thrive on nostrums, adulterated and misbranded foods, etc.), spent not less than \$25,000 a week in distorting news, fomenting opposition, getting together all those who always oppose anything, and generally stirring up as much dust as possible in order to confuse the issue and conceal their real position. These same interests will oppose this proposed legislation just as they fought the pure food and drugs act, and they will spend a lot of money in delaying action. But the bill will eventually pass, for you cannot blind all the people all the time, and they are beginning to appreciate the fact that the health of the human is quite as valuable an asset as the health of hogs or cattle. Insurance companies have known this from the dollars-and-cents point of view for a long time and they are not going to be at all blinded by the thinly veiled opposition of interests that make for ill-health, fraud and deceit. There will be a Bureau or a Department of Public Health in the course of time, just as sure as God made little sour apples; but before it comes we will have located the position of a good many noble citizens who place their own pockets before honesty or the public good.